



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/742,309	12/18/2003	Masaki Kashiwagi	CFA00027US	5665
34904 7590 04/30/2008 CANON U.S.A. INC. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION 15975 ALTON PARKWAY IRVINE, CA 92618-3731				
EXAMINER SINGH, SATWANT K				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2625				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/30/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/742,309

Applicant(s)

KASHIWAGI, MASAKI

Examiner

SATWANT K. SINGH

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 December 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 28 January 2008.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 11, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipate by Kita et al. (US 6,961,139).
5. Regarding Claim 1, Kita et al discloses an image processing apparatus comprising: an image reading unit configured to read image data of a document (scanner section 12); an image storage unit configured to store the image data read by the image reading unit (image memory 14); a display unit configured to display the image data stored in the image storage unit (monitor section 33); a reading control unit configured to perform a successive reading operation, wherein, in the successive reading operation, plural sets of document sheets divided from a series of document

sheets are independently read by the image reading unit (image on each document is read one by one, so as to read the images residing on a plurality of documents), and image data corresponding to the read plural sets of document sheets is stored in the image storage unit as a series of image data corresponding to the series of document sheets (image data, read by scanning section is compressed by the compression/expansion circuit and stored in image memory) (col. 8, lines 16-32, col. 9, line 49-col. 10, line 7); and a control unit configured to enable the display unit to display image data corresponding to the read image data after reading each set of document sheets in the successive reading operation (displaying images based on the image data read from the hard-disk) (col. 8, lines 59-65).

6. Regarding Claim 11 and 21, Kita et al discloses an image processing method comprising: performing a successive reading operation, wherein, in the successive reading operation, plural sets of document sheets divided from a series of document sheets are independently read (image on each document is read one by one, so as to read the images residing on a plurality of documents), and image data corresponding to the read plural sets of document sheets is stored in an image storage unit as a series of image data corresponding to the series of document sheets (image data, read by scanning section is compressed by the compression/expansion circuit and stored in image memory) (col. 8, lines 16-32, col. 9, line 49-col. 10, line 7); and allowing a display unit to display the stored image data corresponding to the read image data after reading each set of document sheets in the successive reading operation (displaying images based on the image data read from the hard-disk) (col. 8, lines 59-65).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10, 12-15, 17, 18, 20, 22-25, 27, 28, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kita et al. in view of Michiie et al. (US 6,980,702).

9. Regarding Claim 2, Kita et al fails to teach an image processing apparatus, wherein the control unit enables the display unit to display the stored image data at an interval between a first reading process for one divided set of document sheets and a second reading process for another divided set of document sheets, the second reading process being performed after the first reading process.

Michiie et al teaches an image processing apparatus, wherein the control unit enables the display unit to display the stored image data at an interval between a first reading process for one divided set of document sheets and a second reading process for another divided set of document sheets (image data representative of a plurality of documents may be sequentially written to the divided portions of the area of the video memory corresponding to a single paper sheet) (col. 6, lines 9-16), the second reading process being performed after the first reading process (plurality of documents sequentially written) (col. 6, lines 9-38).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching of Michiie to sequentially display the scanned documents so the user can visually verify the documents that have just been scanned.

10. Regarding Claim 3, Kita et al fails to teach an image processing apparatus, further comprising: a command acceptance unit configured to accept read-end command in the successive reading operation, wherein, in the successive reading operation, the control unit enables the display unit to display the stored image data before the command acceptance unit accepts the read- end command.

Michiie et al teaches an image processing apparatus, further comprising: a command acceptance unit configured to accept read-end command in the successive reading operation, wherein, in the successive reading operation (address and data lines for reading and writing) (col. 6, lines 24-32), the control unit enables the display unit to display the stored image data before the command acceptance unit accepts the read-end command (input and output of image data executed at the same time) (col. 6, lines 24-32).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching of Michiie to sequentially display the scanned documents so the user can visually verify the documents that have just been scanned.

11. Regarding Claim 4, Kita et al fails to teach an image processing apparatus, wherein, in the successive reading operation, the control unit enables the display unit to display the stored image data before the second reading process is started.

Michiie et al teaches an image processing apparatus, wherein, in the successive reading operation (address and data lines for reading and writing) (col. 6, lines 24-32), the control unit enables the display unit to display the stored image data before the second reading process is started (input and output of image data executed at the same time) (col. 6, lines 24-32).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching of Michiie to sequentially display the scanned documents so the user can visually verify the documents that have just been scanned.

12. Regarding Claim 5, Kita et al fails to teach an image processing apparatus, wherein, in the successive reading operation, the control unit enables the display unit to display the stored image data after completion of the first reading process and before the second reading process is started.

Michiie et al teaches an image processing apparatus, wherein, in the successive reading operation, the control unit enables the display unit to display the stored image data after completion of the first reading process and before the second reading process is started (input and output of image data executed at the same time) (col. 6, lines 24-32).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching of Michiie to sequentially display the scanned documents so the user can visually verify the documents that have just been scanned.

13. Regarding Claim 7, Kita et al fails to teach an image processing apparatus, wherein in response to completion of the first reading process, inputting of a command to display image data stored in the image storage unit on the display unit is enabled.

Michiie et al teaches an image processing apparatus, wherein in response to completion of the first reading process, inputting of a command to display image data stored in the image storage unit on the display unit is enabled (CPU is capable of transferring the image data read out of the image data to the operation panel vial the I/O panel) (col. 6, lines 33-38).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching of Michiie to allow a user to visually verify the images that have been scanned.

14. Regarding Claim 8, Kita et al fails to teach an image processing apparatus, wherein in response to completion of the first reading process, inputting of a read-end command in the successive reading operation is enabled.

Michiie et al teaches an image processing apparatus, wherein in response to completion of the first reading process, inputting of a read-end command in the successive reading operation is enabled (address and data lines for reading and writing) (col. 6, lines 24-32).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching of Michiie to allow a user to end the scanning process.

15. Regarding Claim 10, Kita et al fails to teach an image processing apparatus, further comprising: a suspending instruction unit configured to instruct suspension of the successive reading operation for the series of document sheets and resume the suspended reading operation, wherein the interval is provided by the suspending instruction unit.

Michiie et al teaches an image processing apparatus, further comprising: a suspending instruction unit configured to instruct suspension of the successive reading operation for the series of document sheets and resume the suspended reading operation, wherein the interval is provided by the suspending instruction unit (Fig. 9) (col. 7, lines 23-26).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching of Michiie to allow a user to control the timing of the scanning process.

16. Regarding Claims 12 and 22, Kita et al fails to teach an image processing method, wherein displaying of the stored image data by the display unit is allowed an interval between a first reading process for one divided set of document sheets and a second reading process for another divided set of document sheets, the second reading process being performed after the first reading process

Michiie et al teaches an image processing method, wherein displaying of the stored image data by the display unit is allowed an interval between a first reading process for one divided set of document sheets and a second reading process for another divided set of document sheets (image data representative of a plurality of documents may be sequentially written to the divided portions of the area of the video memory corresponding to a single paper sheet) (col. 6, lines 9-16), the second reading process being performed after the first reading process (plurality of documents sequentially written) (col. 6, lines 9-38).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching of Michiie to sequentially display the scanned documents so the user can visually verify the documents that have just been scanned.

17. Regarding Claims 13 and 23, Kita et al fails to teach an image processing method, further comprising- accepting a read-end command in the successive reading operation, wherein, in the successive reading operation, displaying of the stored image data by the display unit is allowed before the read-end command is accepted.

Michiie et al teaches an image processing method, further comprising- accepting a read-end command in the successive reading operation (address and data lines for reading and writing) (col. 6, lines 24-32), wherein, in the successive reading operation, displaying of the stored image data by the display unit is allowed before the read-end command is accepted (input and output of image data executed at the same time) (col. 6, lines 24-32).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching of Michiie to sequentially display the scanned documents so the user can visually verify the documents that have just been scanned.

18. Regarding Claims 14 and 24, Kita et al fails to teach an image processing method, wherein, in the successive reading operation, displaying of the stored image data by the display unit is allowed before the second reading process is started.

Michiie et al teaches an image processing method, wherein, in the successive reading operation, displaying of the stored image data by the display unit is allowed before the second reading process is started (input and output of image data executed at the same time) (col. 6, lines 24-32).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching of Michiie to sequentially display the scanned documents so the user can visually verify the documents that have just been scanned.

19. Regarding Claims 15 and 25 Kita et al fails to teach an image processing method, wherein, in the successive reading operation, displaying of the stored image data by the display unit is allowed after completion of the first reading process and before the second reading process is started (input and output of image data executed at the same time) (col. 6, lines 24-32).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching of Michiie to

sequentially display the scanned documents so the user can visually verify the documents that have just been scanned.

Michiie et al teaches an image processing method, wherein, in the successive reading operation, displaying of the stored image data by the display unit is allowed after completion of the first reading process and before the second reading process is started.

20. Regarding Claims 17 and 27, Kita et al fails to teach an image processing method, wherein in response to completion of the first reading process, inputting of a command to display image data stored in the image storage unit on the display unit is enabled.

Michiie et al teaches an image processing method, wherein in response to completion of the first reading process, inputting of a command to display image data stored in the image storage unit on the display unit is enabled (CPU is capable of transferring the image data read out of the image data to the operation panel via the I/O panel) (col. 6, lines 33-38).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching of Michiie to allow a user to visually verify the images that have been scanned.

21. Regarding Claims 18 and 28, Kita et al fails to teach an image processing method, wherein in response to completion of the first reading process, inputting of a read-end command in the successive reading operation is enabled.

Michiie et al teaches an image processing method, wherein in response to completion of the first reading process, inputting of a read-end command in the successive reading operation is enabled (address and data lines for reading and writing) (col. 6, lines 24-32).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching of Michiie to allow a user to end the scanning process.

22. Regarding Claims 20 and 30, Kita et al fails to teach an image processing method, further comprising instructing suspension of the successive reading operation for the series of document sheets; and resuming the suspended reading operation, wherein the interval is provided by the instruction.

Michiie et al teaches an image processing method, further comprising instructing suspension of the successive reading operation for the series of document sheets; and resuming the suspended reading operation, wherein the interval is provided by the instruction (Fig. 9) (col. 7, lines 23-26).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching of Michiie to allow a user to control the timing of the scanning process.

23. Claims 6, 9, 16, 19, 26, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kita et al and Michiie et al as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Kanda (US 7,212,307).

24. Regarding Claim 6, Kita et al and Michiie et al fail to teach an image processing apparatus, further comprising- a re-read unit configured to re-read a document page by the image reading unit and replace data corresponding to image data currently displayed on the display unit with image data obtained by the re-reading.

Kanda teaches an image processing apparatus, further comprising- a re-read unit configured to re-read a document page by the image reading unit and replace data corresponding to image data currently displayed on the display unit with image data obtained by the re-reading (image data for each page are read out by means of the memory/HDD control section for a set number of times) (col. 6, lines 17-29).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita and Michiie with the teaching of Kanda to re-read the image data to prevent errors in the output image and make sure the correct image is being output.

25. Regarding Claim 9, Kita et al and Michiie et al fail to teach an image processing apparatus, wherein a re-read command is allowed to be input to re-read a document page by the image reading unit and replace image data currently displayed on the display unit with image data obtained by the re-reading.

Kanda teaches an image processing apparatus, wherein a re-read command is allowed to be input to re-read a document page by the image reading unit and replace image data currently displayed on the display unit with image data obtained by the re-reading (image data for each page are read out by means of the memory/HDD control section for a set number of times) (col. 6, lines 17-29).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita and Michiie with the teaching of Kanda to re-read the image data to prevent errors in the output image and make sure the correct image is being output.

26. Regarding Claim 16 and 26, Kita et al and Michiie et al fail to teach an image processing method, further comprising- re-reading a document page; and replacing image data corresponding to image data currently displayed on the display unit with image data obtained by the re-reading.

Kanda teaches an image processing apparatus, further comprising- re-reading a document page; and replacing image data corresponding to image data currently displayed on the display unit with image data obtained by the re-reading (image data for each page are read out by means of the memory/HDD control section for a set number of times) (col. 6, lines 17-29).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita and Michiie with the teaching of Kanda to re-read the image data to prevent errors in the output image and make sure the correct image is being output.

27. Regarding Claim 19 and 29, Kita et al and Michiie et al fail to teach an image processing apparatus, wherein a re-read command is allowed to be input to re-read a document page and replace image data corresponding to image data currently displayed on the display unit with image data obtained by the re-reading.

Kanda teaches an image processing apparatus, wherein a re-read command is allowed to be input to re-read a document page and replace image data corresponding to image data currently displayed on the display unit with image data obtained by the re-reading (image data for each page are read out by means of the memory/HDD control section for a set number of times) (col. 6, lines 17-29).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita and Michiie with the teaching of Kanda to re-read the image data to prevent errors in the output image and make sure the correct image is being output.

Conclusion

28. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SATWANT K. SINGH whose telephone number is (571)272-7468. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Satwant K. Singh
Examiner
Art Unit 2625

Sks

/Mark K Zimmerman/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625